

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 and 48-79 are all the active claims pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1 – 3, 11 – 15, 48 – 51 and 59 – 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Palese. The remaining active claims, save claims 7, 23, 55 and 71 which are merely objected to, are rejected over the combination of Palese with a series of secondary references cited to show various optical sub-components. Applicants amend the claims for clarification, and traverse the rejections. Applicants' focus will be upon the Palese reference which is central to each of the rejections.

As previously argued, the Palese reference employs a large array of fiber amplifiers, for individually amplifying light of different wavelengths, the array outputs being received and overlapped coherently via a compressor optically coupled to the array. To the extent that Palese may be able to generate composite pulses through this arrangement (which is not illustrated), it is apparent that the composite pulses would be created at the compressor where the individual beams from the fiber array are combined.

In order to further distinguish the array configuration disclosed by Palese, each of the active independent claims has been amended to specify that the composite pulses of the invention are all amplified by the same fiber amplifier (which could of course be one of a series of serially-arranged fiber amplifiers), as disclosed in, e.g., Fig. 6 of the present application. The advantages of the system of the invention as claimed will be readily apparent on a cost and complexity basis alone.

The Examiner will appreciate that the current claim language positively excludes the use of a parallel or array configuration as disclosed by Palese. Further, it would be impossible to modify Palese to achieve the inventive configuration, and to even attempt to do so would be directly contrary to the entirety of the teachings of the Palese disclosure.

Accordingly, the invention as now clarified is clearly distinguished from, and not an obvious departure from Palese.

The remaining references clearly cannot bridge the deficiencies of Palese, and thus the various combinations of teachings cobbled by the Examiner fail for the same reasons as discussed with respect to Palese alone. Further, Applicants would comment that the secondary references only establish, at best, that their various optical components are individually known in the art, but in no way lead to the unique combination claimed by Applicants, either in structure or functionality. For this reason, the subsidiary rejections under § 103 represent no more than an attempt at hindsight reconstruction of the invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/813,269

Attorney Docket No.: A8700

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Richard Turner/
Richard C. Turner
Registration No. 29,710

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 16, 2007